

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 18, 2005. Claims 13 to 22 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 13 and 18 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 17 and 22 were objected to for allegedly failing to further limit the claims. Without conceding the correctness of the objection, Claims 17 and 22 have nonetheless been amended to provide even further clarity of the claimed subject matter so as to make it even clearer as to what additional features are being claimed. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 to 15, 17 to 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,028,513 (Addy) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,078 (Escolar), and Claims 16 and 21 were rejected under § 103(a) over Addy in view of Escolar and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,706,191 (Bassett). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns communication of warning status information. According to the invention, when a warning status has occurred in an electronic device, a user is notified that the warning status has occurred. If the detected warning status is not released within a predetermined time, warning information is transmitted to a registered device that has been registered by the user as a device that is to receive the warning information. If the warning status is not released in spite of transmitting the warning status information to the registered device and if it is determined that the user is not near the device, then the warning information is transmitted to one or more hand-held terminals in an external network according to a predetermined order. Finally, if the warning status is released within a predetermined time having elapsed from the transmission of the warning information to the hand-held terminal,

warning released information indicating that the warning status has been released is transmitted to the hand-held terminal. (See, for example, page 36, line 26 to page 37, line 13) As a result, if the user is not near an electronic device when a warning occurs in a device, the user can receive the warning information on their hand-held terminal, but if the warning status is released within a predetermined time from the warning being transmitted to the terminal, the user will receive notification of the release so that they wont have to expend time checking on the device.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 13 is an electronic device, comprising a detecting unit adapted to detect whether a warning status has occurred, a warning unit adapted to notify to a user that the warning status has occurred, and a communication unit adapted to transmit warning information indicating that the warning status has occurred, wherein, if the warning status is not released within a predetermined time, the communication unit transmits the warning information to a registered device that has been registered by the user as a device that is to receive the warning information, if the warning status is not released in spite of transmitting the warning information to the registered device and if it is determined that the user is not near the electronic device, the communication unit transmits the warning information to one or more hand-held terminals in an external network according to a predetermined order, and if the warning status is released withing a predetermined time having elapsed from the transmission of the warning information to the hand-held terminal, the communication unit transmits warning status released information indicating that the warning status has been released to the hand-held terminal.

Amended independent Claim 18 is a method claim substantially corresponding to Claim 13.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 13 and 18, and in particular is not

seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of, if a detected warning status is not released within a predetermined time, transmitting warning information to a registered device that has been registered by a user as a device that is to receive the warning information, if the warning status is not released in spite of transmitting the warning information to the registered device and if it is determined that the user is not near the device, transmitting the warning information to one or more hand-held terminals in an external network according to a predetermined order, and if the warning status is released within a predetermined time having elapsed from the transmission of the warning information to the hand-held terminal, transmitting warning status released information indicating that the warning status has been released to the hand-held terminal.

As admitted in the Office Action, Addy fails to disclose transmitting the warning information to a hand-held terminal. Thus, Addy fails to disclose the foregoing features of the present invention. Moreover, Addy merely transmits a radio alarm signal, but the transmission of the radio alarm is not initiated as a result of a warning status not being released in spite of transmitting warning information to a registered device and if it is determined that a user is not near the device for which the warning status occurred.

Escolar is seen to disclose that, when an alarm is detected, a contact list of personnel to be notified of the alarm is searched and a contact on the list matching certain criteria is notified of the alarm. If the alarm is not reset after a delay time, the next contact on the list is searched and notified of the alarm. Thus, Escolar merely transmits warning information to subscriber terminals listed in a list 48 in a predetermined order if all alarms have not been cleared (second and third embodiments). This transmission is repeated from the terminal listed on the top to that listed on the bottom until all the alarms are cleared (column 4, lines 29-32 and 48-51). However, Escolar is not seen to disclose or to suggest that, if a warning status is released within a predetermined time having elapsed from transmission of warning information to a hand-held terminal, a communication unit

transmits warning released information indicating that the warning status has been released to the hand-held terminal. That is, Applicants fail to see anything in Escolar in which, once the alarm is released, that a contact in the contact list that has been notified of the alarm receives another notification that the alarm has been released. Accordingly, a combination of Addy and Escolar is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent Claims 13 and 18, are believed to be allowable over Addy and Escolar.

Bassett is not seen to add anything that, when combined with Addy and/or Escolar, would have resulted in the present invention of independent Claims 13 and 18. More particularly, Bassett is not seen to disclose or to suggest anything that, when combined with Addy and/or Escolar, would have resulted in at least the feature of, if a detected warning status is not released within a predetermined time, transmitting warning information to a registered device that has been registered by a user as a device that is to receive the warning information, if the warning status is not released in spite of transmitting the warning information to the registered device and if it is determined that the user is not near the device, transmitting the warning information to one or more hand-held terminals in an external network according to a predetermined order, and if the warning status is released within a predetermined time having elapsed from the transmission of the warning information to the hand-held terminal, transmitting warning status released information indicating that the warning status has been released to the hand-held terminal.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of Claims 13 to 18 are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 100696v1